

### REMARKS

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, based on the phrase "wherein said reference light is unrelated to said image light", has been remedied by the deletion of that phrase.

The claims were also rejected as being anticipated or obvious in view of the disclosures of five different references. By this response, however, independent Claim 1 has been extensively revised to incorporate the concepts of now-cancelled Claims 9 and 10, and to further clarify the intended meaning of Claim 1. In this regard, as now presented, Claim 1 utilizes feedback wherein an image pickup apparatus uses a filter to extract a difference between a frequency of an object light and a frequency of a reference light, and such apparatus controls the frequency of the reference light in accordance with the difference extracted by the filter. With regard to such control, as described in the specification, in a heterodyne technique the frequency of the reference light is changed so as to stabilize the extracted difference within a frequency range corresponding thereto, and in homodyne detection, the frequency of the reference light is changed so that the extracted frequency difference is stabilized at zero (page 6, line 26 to page 8, line 9).

A review of the cited references reveals that no teachings of the Meyzonnetie, Pace, Horiuchi, Wagner and Miyagawa references, taken singly or in combination, disclose a feedback apparatus as claimed in Claim 1. Instead, each reference discloses heterodyne detection which is used for detection of a laser beam reflected by an object. In particular, the references other than Brosnan, Wagner and Miyagawa teach that a reference light and an object light are generated from different light sources. However, none of the cited references of Brosnan (Fig. 2), Meyzonnetie (Fig. 7), Pace (Fig. 1) Horiuchi (Fig. 1), Wagner (Fig. 6) and Miyagawa (Fig. 1)

